

To: Stephanie Fong[sfong@sfcwa.org]; Denton, Debra[Denton.Debra@epa.gov]
From: Vendlinski, Tim
Sent: Mon 4/14/2014 11:52:48 PM
Subject: my follow-up talks with Meghan and Stephen re: Delta RMP discussion

Thanks, Stephanie, for this useful information sources; I look forward to reading them soon.

And thanks to both of you for a useful call.

I called Meghan to discuss our collective concerns (while preserving anonymity the best I could), and I also expressed my concerns to Stephen during the course of a call we had about two matters unrelated to the Delta RMP.

Both of them understood our concerns about the level-of-effort multiplier when the TAC was split into four workgroups, although both of them saw some potential benefits too (Stephen cited two instances where people came to the workgroup meetings and offered to contribute sampling services). I said I didn't know how long we could sustain our participation from Debra if her work was multiplied in this fashion. Meghan understood my concern that the idea could have been vetted better at the Steering Committee (SC) level, but she also observed that the SC was putting its faith in Stephen and Joe to run the TAC as they saw fit. Stephen stressed to me that these workgroups are temporary and not a permanent division of the TAC. I also expressed to Stephen that non-technical (non-qualified?) people were coming to the workgroup meetings, and this further diluted the programmatic interests of EPA and potentially raised conflict-of-interest complications. They both heard me out, and I went on record, but I don't think I can change this current set of circumstances. I took some comfort that this is a temporary arrangement, and I can make sure it is so through the SC.

On the other main issue about them disregarding the report that was already drafted, Meghan agreed that the report was unnecessarily stripped down by Stephen, and that a different approach could have been taken, but again, I think she's deferring to Stephen and Joe. One thing we three can do is to ensure the sound elements of that previous report see the light of day in the new work being done by the TAC and SC. I will read the document so I can serve as a better advocate for building upon good efforts in the past.

I need to go. Please let me know if you wish to have another call or if you want further elaboration of my calls with Meghan and Stephen.

Best, Tim

Tim Vendlinski
Senior Policy Advisor;
Bay Delta Program Manager
EPA Region 9
75 Hawthorne Street (WTR-1)
San Francisco, CA 94105-3901

(415) 972-3469 desk

-----Original Message-----

From: Stephanie Fong [mailto:sfong@sfcwa.org]
Sent: Thursday, April 10, 2014 1:08 PM
To: Denton, Debra; Vendlinski, Tim
Cc: Valerie Connor
Subject: RE: Delta RMP discussion

Thanks for the chat today. Here's a link to the roles and responsibilities document http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/delta_water_quality/comprehensive_monitoring_program/delta_rmp_committee_roles.pdf that says "The TAC co-chairs will provide the communication link between the SC and the TAC and will be assisted by Delta RMP staff (SFEI-ASC) as needed."

I was able to find the draft monitoring plan on the RMP website http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/delta_water_quality/comprehensive_monitoring_program/2012jun13_draft_delta_rmp_frmwrk.pdf but as I look through the list of acknowledgements, I'm a bit puzzled with who Thomas and Brock ended up listing on it. The list included more people than I thought were involved, but at the time, I figured they got input from others that I wasn't aware of. They didn't list any EPA reps, even though I remember Debra providing comments before the public draft was produced. Valentina provided written comments and came to a meeting in the Regional Board's Board Room when we sat in a circle and supported the use of toxicity testing as the main testing tool for initial analysis. The small group I mentioned on our call were invited scientists who met to discuss a semi-internal draft monitoring plan. They used the internal draft to make decisions and changes that later became the draft posted online. That small group included Roger Fujii, Anke M-S, Matt Dekar (USFWS), Chris Foe and Christine Joab (R5), myself, Thomas and a couple others who are slipping my mind at the moment. I would hope Meghan has the sign in sheet from that meeting, but I don't.

There are a number of the old documents on the RMP website, like the program plan and the comments received on the draft monitoring plan http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/delta_water_quality/comprehensive_monitoring_program/2012jul_draft_delta_rmp_com.pdf. Here's the list of organizations who commented on the public draft. California Department of Fish and Game, California Estuary Monitoring Workgroup, Central Valley Clean Water Association, Coalition for a Sustainable Delta, Deanovic, Linda (UC Davis, Aquatic Health Program), Delta Stewardship Council Delta Science Program, Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District, Sacramento Stormwater Quality Partnership, San Joaquin County and Delta Water Quality Coalition, South Delta Water Agency, State and Federal Contractors Water Agency, City of Stockton, and San Joaquin County.

Erwin is out this week, so I'll call Erwin and Gregg early next week and get back to you all. Thanks again!
-Steph

From: Denton, Debra [Denton.Debra@epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 10, 2014 10:00 AM
To: Vendlinski, Tim; Stephanie Fong
Cc: Valerie Connor
Subject: RE: Delta RMP discussion

It is 12 today. Who is calling who??

PEACE = Purposefully Express Appreciation and Compassion for Everyone Debra
Disclaimer: This message was written with voice activated software. It may contain errors. Some of them might be interesting. Observe the context and the meaning will, hopefully, be obvious.

Debra L. Denton, PhD
Environmental Scientist
US EPA Region 9
Standards and TMDL Office
c/o SWRCB
1001 I Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
phone (916) 341-5520
fax (916) 341-5896

